

Remarks

1. Summary of the Office Action

In the Office Action mailed March 25, 2008, (i) the Examiner objected to Figures 1-4 and the Examiner indicated that Figures 1-4 should be designated by a legend such as –Prior Art— because only that which is old is illustrated, (ii) the Examiner objected to informalities on pages 13 and 28 of the specification, (iii) the Examiner rejected claims 1-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention, and (iv) the Examiner rejected claims 1-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by a published document entitled “Sprint PCS J2ME Application Environment” (hereinafter “Papineau”).

2. Claim Amendments and Pending Claims

Applicant has amended claims 1-5, 9, 13, 14, 17, 19, 21, 23, 25, 27, and 32, cancelled claims 8, 11, 20, and 24, and added new claim 34. Claims 1-7, 9, 10, 12-19, 21-23, and 25-34 are currently pending. Of the pending claims, 1, 13, 19, 25, and 32 are independent.

Claim 1 was amended by deleting the word “Java.” By making this amendment, Applicant does not intend to give up coverage for a scenario in which the claimed function of accepting input data into a MIDlet includes accepting input data into a Java MIDlet.

Claims 2 and 3 were amended by deleting the word “Java.” By making this amendment, Applicant does not intend to give up coverage for a scenario in which the claimed Muglet object class is a Java Muglet object class.

Claims 4 and 5 were amended by deleting the word “Java.” By making this amendment, Applicant does not intend to give up coverage for a scenario in which the claimed System object class is a Java System object class.

Claims 13, 25, and 32 were amended by deleting the words “Java 2 Micro Edition (J2ME).” By making this amendment, Applicant does not intend to give up coverage for a scenario in which the claimed MIDlet is a Java 2 Micro Edition (J2ME) MIDlet.

3. Objections to the Drawings

The Examiner objected to Figures 1-4. Applicant has amended Figures 1-4 by adding the legend “Prior Art” to each of Figures 1-4. Applicant submits that the amendments to the drawings overcome the Examiner’s objections to the drawings. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the objections to the drawings.

4. Amendments to the Specification and Objections to the Specification

Applicant has amended the specification in response to the Examiner’s objections to the specification. Additionally, Applicant has amended the specification by deleting a URI (i.e., `mailto:user@sprint.com //mail`) that was recited in Table 5 on page 28, and by correcting typographical errors in the paragraphs starting at page 29, line 17, page 36, line 3, and page 36, line 21.

The Examiner objected to informalities in the specification. First, the Examiner objected to an informality on page 13, line 5, of the specification. In particular, the Examiner indicated that “... or be distributed...” should be “or are distributed.” Applicant has amended the paragraph containing this informality such that the paragraph now recites “or are distributed” instead of “or be distributed.”

Next, the Examiner objected to Table 6 on page 28 of the specification because the table contained an embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. Applicant has amended Table 6 by deleting “`http://sun.java.com/j2me.`”

Applicant submits that the amendments to the specification overcome the Examiner's objections to the specification. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the objections to the specification.

5. Response to Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

The Examiner rejected claims 1-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. In rejecting claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, the Examiner argued that claim 1 recites "Java" and that the scope of claim 1 is uncertain since a trademark or trade name cannot be used properly to identify any particular material or product. Additionally, the Examiner argued that claims 2-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for the same reasoning as applied to claim 1.

Applicant has cancelled claims 8, 11, 20, and 24. Therefore, the rejection of claims 8, 11, 20, and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, is moot.

Applicant has amended claims 1-5, 13, 25, and 32, at least in part, by deleting each instance of the word "Java." Applicant submits that the amendments to claims 1-5, 13, 25, and 32 overcome the Examiner's rejection of claims 1-7, 9, 10, 12, 13, 15-18, 25, 26, and 28-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

With respect to the rejection of claims 19 and 21-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, claims 19 and 21-23 did not recite the word "Java" at the time the office action was mailed and claims 19 and 21-23 do not currently recite the word "Java." Applicant submits that claims 19 and 21-23 are not indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of Applicant's invention.

Next, the Examiner indicated that since claims 14, 21, and 27 are directed to a computer readable medium but are dependent upon method claims, it is uncertain whether these claims are dependent or independent claims. The Examiner also indicated that it appears Applicant intended to claim inventions that are of different statutory classes from the independent claims, and claims 14, 21, and 27 should be written in dependent form.

Applicant has amended claims 14, 21, and 27. Applicant submits that the amendments to claims 14, 21, and 27 remove any uncertainty as to whether these claims are dependent or independent claims. Applicant submits that the amendments to claims 14, 21, and 27, as well as the amendments to claims 13, 19, and 25, overcome the rejection of claims 14, 21, and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

6. Response to Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner rejected claims 1-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Papineau. Applicant has cancelled claims 8, 11, 20, and 24. Therefore, the rejection of claims 8, 11, 20, and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) is moot.

Under M.P.E.P. § 2131, a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. Independent claims 1, 13, 19, 25, and 32, as amended, clearly distinguish over Papineau.

In particular, Papineau does not teach or suggest (i) a first object-oriented object class for accepting input data into a MIDlet within a MIDlet Suite from an application management system on a mobile information device, wherein the input data is generated by a non-MIDlet application on the mobile information device, as recited in claim 1, (ii) using the object-oriented method in the object-oriented class to set output data from the MIDlet, wherein the output data is available to an application management system on the mobile information device and to a non-

MIDlet application on the mobile information device, as recited in claim 13, (iii) the MIDlet using one or more object-oriented methods in the object-oriented class to accept from the application management system the input data created by the non-MIDlet application, as recited in claim 19, (iv) wherein the Muglet includes a plurality of object-oriented methods in an object-oriented object class available for using input data created by a non-MIDlet application, as recited in claim 25, and (v) a System object-oriented object class for setting output data from the MIDlet within the MIDlet Suite when the MIDlet is terminated on the mobile information device, wherein the output data is available to the application management system on the mobile information device and to a non-MIDlet application, as recited in claim 32.

At best, Papineau discloses (i) an application management system (AMS) that can pass context into a MIDlet using a Muglet class, (ii) the AMS can process context passed out from a MIDlet using the Exit URI in a System class, and (iii) a clipboard is a facility for *cooperating MIDlets in different suites to exchange small amounts of data*. (See, e.g., Papineau, pages 28 and 37).

Even if it is assumed for the sake of argument that the context passed into a MIDlet using the Muglet class amounts to the small amount of *data exchanged between cooperating MIDlets* in different suites, Papineau still does not disclose or suggest (i) a first object-oriented object class for accepting input data into a MIDlet within a MIDlet Suite from an application management system on a mobile information device, wherein the input data is generated by a non-MIDlet application on the mobile information device, as recited in claim 1, (ii) the MIDlet using one or more object-oriented methods in the object-oriented class to accept from the application management system the input data created by the non-MIDlet application, as recited in claim 19, and (iii) wherein the Muglet includes a plurality of object-oriented methods in an

object-oriented object class available for using input data created by a non-MIDlet application, as recited in claim 25.

Additionally, even if it is assumed for the sake of argument that the context passed out from the MIDlet using the Exit URI in the system class amounts to the small amount of *data exchanged between cooperating MIDlets* in different suites, Papineau still does not disclose or suggest (i) using the object-oriented method in the object-oriented class to set output data from the MIDlet, wherein the output data is available to an application management system on the mobile information device and to a non-MIDlet application on the mobile information device, as recited in claim 13, and (ii) a System object-oriented object class for setting output data from the MIDlet within the MIDlet Suite when the MIDlet is terminated on the mobile information device, wherein the output data is available to the application management system on the mobile information device and to a non-MIDlet application, as recited in claim 32.

Because Papineau does not teach or suggest each and every element of claims 1, 13, 19, 25, and 32, Papineau does not anticipate claims 1, 13, 19, 25, and 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). Further, because each of claims 2-7, 9, 10, 12, 14-18, 21-23, 26-31, 33, and 34 depend from one of claims 1, 13, 19, 25, and 32 and necessarily include all of the limitations of one of claims 1, 13, 19, 25, and 32, claims 2-7, 9, 10, 12, 14-18, 21-23, 26-31, 33, and 34 are allowable as well.

7. Conclusion

Applicant believes that all of the pending claims have been addressed in this response. However, failure to address a specific rejection or assertion made by the Examiner does not signify that Applicant agrees with or concedes that rejection or assertion.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that claims 1-7, 9, 10, 12-19, 21-23, and 25-34 are in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims.

Respectfully submitted,

**MCDONNELL BOEHNEN
HULBERT & BERGHOFF LLP**

Date: June 11, 2008

By: /David L. Ciesielski/
David L. Ciesielski
Reg. No. 57,432